



4. Defendant, Bay Area Credit Service (hereafter “Defendant”), is a foreign limited liability company with a principal place of business at 1901 W. 10th Street, Antioch, CA 94509, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

5. The names of the individual collectors are unknown but they will be added by amendment when determined through discovery.

### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

6. Plaintiff incurred a financial obligation that was primarily for family, personal or household purposes, and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

7. Thereafter, the debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to Defendant for collection from Plaintiff.

8. The Defendant then began attempts to collect this debt from the Plaintiff, which was a “communication” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

9. The Defendant called the Plaintiff four times a day for several weeks in a row.

10. The Defendant failed to send the Plaintiff a validation letter.

11. The Defendant used abusive language while communicating with the Plaintiff.

12. The Defendant threatened to garnish the Plaintiff’s wages.

13. The Defendant threatened to sue the Plaintiff without an intention to do so.

14. The Defendant contacted the Plaintiff’s previous place of employment regarding the Plaintiff’s debt.

15. The Plaintiff has suffered actual damages as a result of these illegal collection communications in the form of humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration, embarrassment, amongst other negative emotions, as well as suffering from unjustified and abusive invasions of personal privacy at the Plaintiff's home and workplace.

**COUNT I**

**VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT  
15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.***

16. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

17. The Defendant contacted the Plaintiff at a place and during a time known to be inconvenient for the Plaintiff, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1).

18. The Defendant communicated with individuals other than the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff's attorney, or a credit bureau, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b).

19. The Defendant used profane and abusive language when speaking with the consumer, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(2).

20. The Defendant caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5).

21. The Defendant threatened the Plaintiff with garnishment if the debt was not paid, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(4).

22. The Defendant threatened to take legal action, without actually intending to do so, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5).

23. The Defendant failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the amount of the debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1).

24. The Defendant failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the name of the original creditor to whom the debt was owed, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(2).

25. The Defendant failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the Plaintiff's right to dispute the debt within thirty days, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(3).

26. The Defendant failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice informing the Plaintiff of a right to have verification and judgment mailed to the Plaintiff, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(4).

27. The Defendant failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice containing the name and address of the original creditor, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(5).

28. The Defendant continued collection efforts even though the debt had not been validated, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(b).

29. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendant constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

30. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendant's violations.

## **COUNT II**

### **VIOLATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, M.G.L. c. 93A § 2, *et seq.***

31. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

32. The Defendant employed unfair or deceptive acts to collect the debt, in violation of M.G.L. c. 93A § 2.

33. Defendant's failure to comply with these provisions constitutes an unfair or deceptive act under M.G.L. c. 93A § 11 and, as such, the Plaintiff is entitled to double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees.

### **COUNT III**

#### **INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION**

34. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

35. The *Restatement of Torts, Second*, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."

36. Massachusetts further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendant violated Massachusetts state law.

37. Defendant intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing Plaintiff with frequent telephone calls several times per day, abusing the Plaintiff with condescending and obscene language, and threatening legal action.

38. The telephone calls made by Defendant to Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, "hounding the plaintiff," and, "a substantial burden to his existence," thus satisfying the *Restatement of Torts, Second*, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

39. The conduct of the Defendant in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

40. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from Defendant.

41. All acts of Defendant and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendant is subject to punitive damages.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against Defendant;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for each violation pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A) against Defendant;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against Defendant;
4. Double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to M.G.L. c. 93A § 3(A);
5. Actual damages from Defendant for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for Plaintiff;

6. Punitive damage; and
7. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

**TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS**

Dated: July 7, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By



Sergei Lemberg  
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.  
1100 Summer Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06905  
Telephone: (203) 653-2250  
Facsimile: (877) 795-3666  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
B.B.O. No. 650671